

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE             | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/582,220  | 06/08/2006              | Shinya Mizone        | 1343.46122X00       | 2916             |  |
| 20457 7590 06/19/2009<br>ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP |                         |                      | EXAM                | EXAMINER         |  |
| 1300 NORTH S  | ORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET |                      | SMITH, JEREMIAH R   |                  |  |
| SUITE 1800<br>ARLINGTON                                       | VA 22209-3873           | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |  |
|   |                         | 1791                 |                     |                  |  |
|   |                         |                      |                     |                  |  |
|   |                         |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|   |                         |                      | 06/19/2009          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)  |  |  |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| 10/582,220      | MIZONE ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit      |  |  |
| JEREMIAH SMITH  | 1791          |  |  |

|  | JEREMIAH SMITH  | 1791   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 05 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP   | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A  | LLOWANCE.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (3) application ( | he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi<br>polication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the<br>oplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31 or (3) a Request<br>or Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A   |   | n the final rejection, whi                                 | chever is later. In                      |  |  |  |  |  |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la<br>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | date of the final rejection                                | n.                                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07<br>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date   |   | 36(a) and the annronriat                                   | e extension fee                          |  |  |  |  |  |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex-<br>under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the<br>set forth in (0) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later<br>may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)<br>NOTICE OF APPEAL  | tension and the corresponding amount of<br>shortened statutory period for reply origing<br>than three months after the mailing date   | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.   | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f  | iled within two months                                     | s of the date of                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                     | appeal. Since a                          |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> </ol>   |   |  | cause                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  |   | E below);  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>  |   | lucing or simplifying ti                                   | ne issues for                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a   | corresponding number of finally reje  | cted claims.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12   | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor  | mpliant Amendment (  | PTOL-324).                               |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>  |   | .,,  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).  |   | imely filed amendmer                                       | nt canceling the                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided.</li> </ol>   |   | be entered and an e  | xplanation of                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>y and was not earlier presented. Se  | l and/or appellant fail<br>e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1             | s to provide a<br>).                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio</li> </ol>  | n of the status of the claims after er  | itry is below or attach                                    | ed.                                      |  |  |  |  |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  | t does NOT place the application in   | condition for allowan                                      | ce because:                              |  |  |  |  |  |
| See Continuation Sheet.  | (DTO(CD(00) D N-(-)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).  13. Other:   | (PTO/Sb/08) Paper No(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| /Joseph S. Del Sole/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the applied art Nakata, Goldwasser, and Tabata are not combinable, because they are not analogous art. However, Nakata is directed to production of a household good, while Goldwasser discloses improved plastic materials for household applications. Like Nakata, Tabata is directed to the production of a household item, which is extruded from plastic materials. Nakata teaches a method of making an elastic strip in the form of a doormat. The claimed materials selection of applicant are different from those of Nakata, but are not novel and have been known in the art of production of household goods for more than 20 years as pointed out by applicant and demonstrated by Goldwasser. The materials of Goldwasser could be incorporated into the method of Nakata with only simple substitution vielding predictable results; therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness for substitution exists (See MPEP 2141). The feel of a doormat is a consideration; therefore, foamed materials are known to be used in the manufacture of doormats (see USP's 3506600 and 3573142) and other household goods. Tabata demonstrates that the claimed foamable composition and method steps were known in the art at the time of invention for the production of elastic strips for the manufacture of household goods. Once again, a prima facie case of obviousness exists over simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results. Applicant also argues that "solidification through heating" is not taught by Tabata. However, Tabata teaches heating the temperature of the bath at a desired temperature using heaters as previously explained in the Office action mailed on 3/6/09. A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would understand that the solidification temperature of the liquid should be selected based on the properties of the material to be solidified. Furthermore, the method claims 2 and 3 do not explicitly require a heating step and no curing or crosslinking step is claimed...